

**US Army Corps
of Engineers**

**USACE
Fiscal Year 2004-2006
Consolidated
Command
Guidance**

**HQUSACE
July 2003**

18 Jul 03

FOREWORD

The Fiscal Year 2004 (FY 04-06) Consolidated Command Guidance (CCG) is the Command's near-term blueprint for fulfilling our Vision. It reviews our strategic planning process, provides resource guidance, and specifies corporate metrics and management targets.

In FY 04 we are implementing a modification to our strategic planning process, as approved by the Command Council. We are creating individual strategic plans for our four mission areas (CW, MP, RE, and RD). An integrated command-wide strategic plan will follow. The first iteration of the mission strategic plans, which are to be updated annually, will be discussed at the August Senior Leaders Conference and then linked to other strategic forums.


In this coming fiscal year we are enhancing our efforts in several areas to help implement the President's Management Agenda (PMA). This government-wide drive for a more efficient and citizen-focused federal government is centered on five major themes: Strategic Management of Human Capital, Competitive Sourcing, Improved Financial Performance, Expanded Electronic Government, and Budget and Performance Integration.

This past year, in our USACE 2012 initiative, we have been engaged in a major review of our Executive Management and Direction (ED&M) missions and functions. These are primarily performed at HQUSACE and our Division Headquarters Offices and funded through the Operations & Maintenance-Army (OMA) account and the General Expenses (GE) Civil Works account. This review aimed to improve service to our customers by streamlining our ED&M processes and structures. We will begin implementing our decisions from this review in FY 04.

This year the Nation has benefited greatly from our past efforts at streamlining our processes and being prepared to support the Army in peace and war. We have sent hundreds of military and civilian personnel to support operations and reconstruction efforts in Afghanistan and Iraq. Applying the principles of the Project Management Business Process (PMBP) and Field Force Engineering doctrine, this work has been efficiently organized by our USACE Operations Center, implemented effectively by our MSCs and field offices, and superbly executed by our dedicated and competent people. We have also created a USACE Office of Homeland Security to work with the Department of Homeland Security and with Northern Command (NORTHCOM).

Like the rest of the federal government, DOD, and The Army, we must continue to transform ourselves to make the Corps more agile, flexible, progressive, and innovative in the future. PMBP will be the roadmap and major enabler for that journey. The rollout of P2 this year will provide USACE with a powerful management tool for the full utilization of PMBP and for achieving our management goals.

ESSAYONS!



ROBERT B. FLOWERS
Lieutenant General, USA
Commanding

FY 04 CONSOLIDATED COMMAND GUIDANCE

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION i

CHAPTER 1 USACE STRATEGIC PLANNING 1-1

CHAPTER 2 RESOURCES 2-1

CHAPTER 3 MEASURES OF SUCCESS 3-1

ANNEX A - RELATIONSHIP OF THE CCG TO PUBLIC LAW A-1

INTRODUCTION

GENERAL

The CCG is a single document which for the past several years has presented a summary of USACE's strategic direction, resource guidance, and performance requirements for the upcoming fiscal year and outyears. The Strategic Readiness System (SRS), CMR and other types of performance review sessions have and will provide mission execution feedback to USACE Commanders.

USES AND ORGANIZATION OF THE CCG:

1. FY 04 Consolidated Command Guidance is a major command-level document that outlines USACE resources and procedures to monitor mission execution. This document:

a. Links the Corps Strategic Vision and the command-wide corporate strategic focus areas to mission resourcing and execution: Chapter 1.

b. Provides a road map for the resources available to the Corps: Chapter 2.

c. Establishes the FY 04 Performance Execution targets and the SRS/CMR indicators: Chapter 3.

d. Documents as guidance the SRS balanced scorecard goals by which we have chosen to specify our strategic change goals.

2. Consolidated Guidance will be used by HQUSACE to:

a. Transmit changes in Manpower and Budget Guidance as required.

b. Establish mission execution visibility and accountability at operational levels: Major Subordinate Commands (MSCs), Engineer Research and Development Center (ERDC), Field Operating Activities (FOAs) and Districts.

3. Major Subordinate Commanders, District Commanders, ERDC Commander, and FOA Directors are expected to use the CCG to help them establish:

a. Organizational goals, objectives, plans, schedules and milestones to support the Corps' Vision.

b. A performance monitoring system (SRS) prescribes performance changes required to achieve the USACE strategic goals.

c. The systems to provide a free-flow of data and information throughout the Command and HQUSACE.

FY 04 CONSOLIDATED COMMAND GUIDANCE

CHAPTER 1

USACE STRATEGIC PLANNING

The direction-setting USACE Vision document and the more detailed USACE Campaign Plan jointly provide guidance on how USACE will further improve its service to the Army and the Nation. This is occurring through emphasis on three specific strategic goal areas: People, Process, and Communication. People are the foundation of the Corps, Process enables our effectiveness, and Communication is fundamental in our role as public servants.

In support of our Strategic Vision and Campaign Plan, we are preparing four mission-area Strategic Plans, and an integrated USACE Strategic Plan. Because of the way the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) treats our Civil Works program and its responsibility under the Government and Performance Act of 1993 (GPRA), we have been preparing a Civil Works strategic plan annually since the mid-1990's. This year our other three mission-areas, Military Programs, Real Estate, and Research and Development, are also preparing strategic plans. These plans, plus our integrated USACE plan, will focus on the desired outcomes of our programs, and our projections of future trends in those areas.

SELECTED FEDERAL SECTOR STRATEGIC DEVELOPMENTS

President's Management Agenda

The President's Management Agenda (PMA) was announced in 2001, and is being led by OMB. This agenda, directed at all agencies within the federal government, is focused on five major themes: Strategic Management of Human Capital, Competitive Sourcing, Improved Financial Performance, Expanded Electronic Government, and Budget and Performance Integration. Although USACE is actively working on initiatives within each of these areas, two of these areas, Competitive Sourcing and Budget and Performance Integration will have the most visible impacts on our offices and personnel during the coming year.

Under the Competitive Sourcing initiative, this year USACE and other federal agencies will begin studies of some functions and positions formally classified as "commercial". At the end of May 2003, OMB released the latest version of OMB Circular A-76 (superseding the 1986 version), which governs the process of such studies. The results of these studies will influence the future mix of our civil service and contractor workforces. Following the Budget and Performance theme, this year our Civil Works budget submission includes comparing alternative budget levels with expected outcomes of our programs. In future years, our budgets will be influenced by how well we achieve our intended program outcomes.

Strategic Measurement Trends

In general, both the Congress and the executive branch are putting increasing emphasis on strategic measurements, through GRPA, through the PMA, and starting last year within the Army, through the Strategic Readiness System (SRS). The overall intent of this new emphasis, as in the Army's Balanced-Scorecard-based SRS, is to supplement traditional operational measures with results-oriented metrics. Operational measures are clearly required for efficient management, but they are not sufficient for broad-scale programmatic judgments.

Through the CMR and other means, USACE has tracked operational measures (rate of funds expenditure, FTE utilization, etc.) for decades, and will continue to do so. We have also taken steps toward establishing and using more strategic measures, such as the Strategic Management Review (also based on the Balanced Scorecard concept) instituted in 1998. Currently, we are attempting to incorporate strategic measures based on the USACE campaign plan into our Command Staff Inspections.

In the future, both our own imperatives and direction from our higher authorities will lead us further into the use of strategic measures. These types of measures are difficult to define well, and often more difficult to maintain measurement continuity, because their duration extends beyond command cycles and presidential administrations. After delay and much travail, OMB has recently released a draft of their Performance Reference Manual, more than 60 pages of guidance on how federal agencies should develop and use strategic performance measures. This is one more step in advancing the understanding and use of outcome-based metric within the federal government.

This summer will likely see significant USACE developments on efforts like USACE 2012, Civil Works performance measures, and our programmatic strategic plans. Following these events, we anticipate adding to, and refining, our use of strategic metrics within USACE.

“Defense Transformation for the 21st Century Act of 2003”

This bill, which includes a section dealing with the “National Security Personnel System” is likely to pass into law this year. It will have major impacts on how the Department of Defense functions, as well as on how its workforce is managed. Like the Goldwater-Nichols Act of the 1980's, it represents a strategic shift for all DoD agencies, including USACE.

Selected Command Initiatives

As an Army Major Command, USACE priorities during this past year have focused on supporting the Global War on Terrorism, The Army in Transformation, and the Nation in disaster relief. Within the Army budget, our number one resource priority has been and continues to be building the Field Force Engineer capability. This capability supports the geographic combatant commanders, as in

Operation Iraqi Freedom. Our teleEngineering system couples the active duty engineer force with DoD's most highly skilled engineering practitioners and computational assets for real-time support to the fight, and also forms a model for future USACE engineering activities within CONUS. Also continuing from the past, our second critical resource priority remains the area of topographic support to combat forces. The increased OPTEMPO for the Army since September 11, 2001, and our provision of topographic engineering assets relying heavily on supplemental appropriations, clearly indicates the need for an increase in permanent funding to maintain the required base capability.

Status Updates for Selected other Strategic Initiatives

a. Learning Organization, and Environmental Operating Principles. For both of these initiatives we are continuing to operationalize our practice, applying them throughout our daily activities and to all of the products and services we provide. Both initiatives represent cultural modifications within USACE that will continue well into the future.

THE USACE STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT PROCESS

In the past year, we have made only modest changes to the USACE Strategic Management Process. The major new departure has been our work on mission-area, outcome-focused strategic plans. Overall, USACE senior leaders continue to try to balance the principles of sound internal strategic management, as applied in the private sector, with the requirements of a public sector agency influenced by several key governing cycles: those of federal appropriations on an annual basis, congressional elections every two years, and presidential elections every four years. In addition, USACE responds to several different external centers of authority, in the Administration, in the Pentagon, and in the Congress.

In order to dovetail with the four-year command cycle for the Chief of Engineers, USACE strategic planning and management needs to combine long-term planning with shorter-term strategies and actions, and to link our budgeting decisions to the planning effort. The optimal long-term planning effort for USACE would commence at some point in the middle of each Chief's tenure, to lay the groundwork for strategic decisions by the next Chief. This effort would culminate shortly after the change of command, when the new Chief would review strategic recommendations for applicability to his new responsibility. Then, during his first six months, the new Chief would incorporate the results of this long-range planning effort with his current imperatives to refresh the USACE Vision and adopt the major initiatives to be emphasized during his tenure. This approach is designed to make the SMP an established routine recognized by Corps leaders as an effective, fair and efficient, forward-based management planning tool.

From the standpoint of strategic management, the remainder of each Chief's term would involve the implementation, measurement, and fine-tuning of his strategic initiatives. This process would then partially overlap with the initiation of the next long-range planning effort. This year, FY 04, represents the fourth year in this four-year command cycle. Thus, we will focus on strategic continuity and preparation for the transition to the 51st Chief of Engineers.

To complement formal USACE strategic planning it is imperative for all USACE leaders to “manage strategically” in their day-to-day activities. The eight (8) designated structural components of the SMP are described and discussed below.

- Issues Management Board (IMB). This body consists of the assembled HQUSACE General Officer and Senior Executive Service members who are stationed at HQUSACE. The purpose of the IMB is to discuss, and/or make recommendations on, strategic issues of significance to HQUSACE, and on major operational issues. The IMB was chartered to establish a structure and process for our HQ SES and GO members to jointly engage in strategic dialogue. One of the major IMB roles is to help set the agendas for the quarterly Command Council meetings.
- The Command Council (CC). This group consist of all HQ GOs, all MSC and Center Commanders, plus six SESs (currently three from HQUSACE and three from the MSCs). Their purpose is to address strategic issues and make recommendations to the Commanding General (as CC chair). Each member has selected an Emerging Leader Program graduate to serve as a staff assistant to their CC member. The Emerging Leaders Conference (ELC) CC Liaison Team serves as support staff as well as participating as shadows to this strategic process, thereby observing how leaders lead, and how issues progress from concepts to decisions.
- Command Management Review (CMR). The CMR is a quarterly meeting in which all HQUSACE Staff principals meet jointly with all MSC Commanders to address measures of operational efficiency and effectiveness. These measures are portrayed and compared across all MSCs to depict a Corps-wide status report that identifies areas for improvement and promotes sharing of best practices. The CMR now is often held by VTC, in order to minimize travel requirements. CMR charts are posted on the USACE INET web site: <http://www.usace.army.mil/inet/functions/rm/business/cmr.htm>
Although we strive for stability in CMR measures, there is generally some change in measures through the year (see Chapter 3 of this document for guidance on recurring CMR measures).
- Senior Leaders Conference (SLC). The SLC is an annual conference held in the late summer that brings together all USACE SESs, MSC and Center Commanders, HQUSACE Staff Principals, and FOA Directors. This conference constitutes an annual senior level working session at which strategic issues are briefed, discussed, and worked. It is through this milieu that the Commander is able to ensure focus and clarity of senior leadership with regard to his key strategic initiatives.
- Emerging Leaders Conference (ELC). Conducted concurrently with the SLC, the ELC is an annual conference held for a group of competitively selected mid-level USACE personnel. This is a combined educational and networking opportunity for this select

group. The ELC agenda consists of both individual assessment modules as well as attendance at joint SLC-ELC sessions where major strategic issues are briefed and discussed. From a strategic perspective, the ELC is a major investment in developing USACE's future leaders in the strategic dialogue.

- District Engineers Conferences. Twice annually the USACE District Engineers meet to address strategic issues, exchange lessons learned, make recommendations to the Commander, and receive his guidance. First, typically in the fall/winter, the District Engineers assemble in Washington, D.C., for a two-day session of corporate updates, strategic dialogue, and face-to-face idea exchanges with the Commander. In the spring, they travel to Ft. Leonard Wood to join with MSC Commanders, SESs, HQUSACE senior staff, and the other members of the Engineer Regiment to focus primarily on project and policy updates and team building events. (NOTE, during the spring of 2003, the annual ENFORCE session was not held due to events surrounding Operation Iraqi Freedom.) Although this spring session at Ft. Leonard Wood is not a USACE-only event, it is a recurring opportunity to coalesce the energy of the USACE headquarters and field leadership.
- Command Inspections. An annual series of Command inspection visits which the Deputy Commanding General and the HQUSACE staff principals conduct to ensure regional level implementation of the Strategic Vision. The agenda for these visits is structured around the three strategic goals of People, Process, and Communication. All read aheads and after-action reports methodically enumerate (function-by-function) how the MSC's are addressing those goals.
- Consolidated Command Guidance (CCG). This annual guidance document strives to issue both the strategic and tactical guidance required for major and recurring matters of significance Command-wide. This document is provided in hard copy as well as on the INET home page: <http://www.usace.army.mil/inet/functions/rm/business/ccg.htm>

Organizational strategic planning must take into account and adapt to both internal and external imperatives. Internally we have recognized the need to better nurture and manage our people, to improve our internal processes, and to communicate more effectively with our own people and with our external stakeholders. Externally, it is clear that significant changes in the domestic and international environment will continue to impact our future in ways that will never be fully predictable. We must plan to be flexible enough to adapt to whatever impacts come our way.

RELATIONSHIP OF THE CCG TO PUBLIC LAW

The CCG is built on a clear and modern foundation of public laws. The six pillars of management in the U.S. Government noted below are dynamic, fully implemented by most Government organizations and directive in nature for all U.S. Executive Agencies. Our CCG and, indeed, our entire

existing—and future—USACE management organization must answer to these Federal mandates. It follows then that our CCG must be fashioned so as to carefully reflect each of the following six overarching Public Laws for management.

- Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act of 1982
(Public Law 97-255)
- Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990, (CFO)
(Public Law 101-576)
- Government Performance and Results Act of 1993, (GPRA or Results Act)
(Public Law 103-62)
- Government Management Reform Act of 1994
(Public Law 103-356)
- Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, (PRA)
(Public Law 104-13)
- Clinger-Cohen Act, (formally referred to as the Information
Technology Management Reform Act [ITMRA])
(Public Law 104-106), 1996

The relationship of our USACE CCG to each of these is briefly summarized in Annex A.